

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 192

FL 003 669

AUTHOR Pinder, William Whitmore
TITLE Factors Influencing Attitudes of Florida Teachers
toward Modern Foreign Language Teaching
Methodology.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 85p.; Doctoral dissertation
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Background; Educational Background; Educational
Equipment; Instructional Program Divisions; *Language
Instruction; Language Laboratories; *Modern
Languages; Secondary Schools; Second Language
Learning; *State Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher
Certification; *Teaching Methods; Teaching
Techniques

ABSTRACT

This doctoral dissertation identifies certain factors which influence the attitudes of Florida modern language teachers toward contemporary teaching methodology. The study begins with a philosophical and historical view of methods of teaching modern foreign languages. Data, collected from 10 percent of the modern foreign language teachers in secondary schools in Florida by means of a personal questionnaire and an attitudinal scale related to foreign language teaching methods, are analyzed. Five salient factors which evolved from the scale are correlated with characteristics in the respondents' personal and professional backgrounds. Conclusions indicate that teacher attitudes toward modern foreign language teaching methodology are not significantly related to sex, age, foreign language teaching experience, academic degree, how the second language was learned, experience with the language laboratory, or whether the teacher has had training in special foreign language workshops and programs. (RL)

ED 069192

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Factors Influencing Attitudes of Florida
Teachers Toward Modern Foreign
Language Teaching Methodology

By

WILLIAM WHITMORE PINDER

FL 003 669

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
1972

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vii
ABSTRACT.	viii
 CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.	1
General Introduction.	1
Purpose of the Study.	4
Need for the Study.	5
Definition of Terms	7
Procedure	8
Questions for Study	8
Statement of Null Hypotheses.	9
II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.	10
Historical Aspects of the Problem . . .	10
The Language Laboratory	16
Methodology and Student Achievement . .	16
The Pennsylvania Studies.	18
Comments on Pennsylvania Studies. . . .	20
Other Pertinent Studies	25
Observational Systems	28
Summary	30
III PROCEDURES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY.	32
Limitation of the Study	32
Population and Sample	32
Instrumentation	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER		Page
IV	DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION.	37
	Factor Analysis	37
	Results	41
V	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . .	50
	Summary	50
	Conclusions	51
	Implications.	53
APPENDICES		
A	FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE. . .	58
B	FOREIGN LANGUAGE SCALE OF BELIEFS	60
C	LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN.	65
D	FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN	66
E	FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN ABOUT QUESTIONNAIRE AND SCALE	67
F	LETTER SENT TO A RANDOM GROUP OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS FOR A SECOND MARKING OF FLSB FOR A RELIABILITY TEST.	68
G	INTERCORRELATION OF FACTOR SCORES	69
H	FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FIVE FACTORS SELECTED FROM A VARIMAX SOLUTION WITH 32 ITEMS AND 12 FACTORS.	70
I	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (FLTQ).	72

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

APPENDICES	<u>Page</u>
J SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE SCALE OF BELIEFS (FLSB)	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	75
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	79

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		<u>Page</u>
1	Point Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between Factors of the FLSB and Items of the FLTQ	43
2	Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between Factors of the FLSB and Items of the FLTQ .	45
3	Analysis of Variance in Item Seven of the FLTQ--How the Second Language Was Learned-- Using the Factor Scores of the FLSB	47
4	Analysis of Variance in Item Eight of the FLTQ--Experience with the Language Laboratory--Using the Factors of the FLSB.	48
5	Test-Retest Reliability of the Items on the Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs	54

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

FACTORS INFLUENCING ATTITUDES OF FLORIDA
TEACHERS TOWARD MODERN FOREIGN
LANGUAGE TEACHING METHODOLOGY

By

William Whitmore Pinder

March, 1972

Chairman: William M. Alexander
Major Department: Curriculum and Instruction

The purpose of this study was to identify certain factors which influence the attitudes of Florida modern foreign language teachers toward contemporary teaching methodology.

The study was introduced by a philosophical and historical view of methods of teaching modern foreign languages.

Data were collected from 10 percent of the modern foreign language teachers in secondary schools in the state of Florida by means of a personal questionnaire and an attitudinal scale related to foreign language teaching methods.

The data were factor analyzed and five salient factors evolved from the scale. These five factors were then correlated with characteristics in the respondents' personal and professional backgrounds.

This investigation tried to determine if there were factors in the teachers' professional and personal backgrounds that were associated with their attitudes toward contemporary methods of teaching modern foreign languages. It also sought to correlate factors from the attitudinal scale with personal characteristics of the subjects.

Standard statistical treatments of the data did not show any significance. Correlations were all below what was needed for significance at the .05 level.

It was concluded from the study that the attitudes of Florida teachers toward modern foreign language teaching methodology are not significantly related to: sex, age, foreign language teaching experience, academic degree, how the second language was learned, experience with the language laboratory, nor whether or not the teacher has had training in special foreign language workshops and programs.

It was suggested that the study be replicated with some structural changes.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

The study of foreign languages has been the subject of debate for more than 2,000 years. These discussions have ranged in nature from social to academic. During both world wars the teaching of languages native to our enemies was under attack by conservative critics. This was especially true of the teaching of German in the elementary and secondary schools during these periods. On the academic level the controversy over the teaching of foreign languages has been more extensive. It has included the problems of which languages to teach as well as for what period of time and to whom they should be taught. Most recent discussions in professional educational circles have centered on:

- 1) which methods to use and 2) a comparison of several methods based on student achievement.

Much of the recent writings on foreign language theory and teaching methodology has been confusing to many practitioners in the profession today. Bourque has stated that

this confusion is due in large part to the existence of several theories and approaches to teaching foreign languages which have been in vogue in the past few decades. She has said that most recent theories can be classified into three groups:

- 1) Language is communication (audiolingualism).
- 2) Language is culture.
- 3) Language is Language (traditional) (5:4).

This pluralism in methodological theory has created a multitude of teachers who feel that they can do justice to all three of these categories. This has produced an eclectic approach that usually does not meet the objectives of any of the groups mentioned above.

While the following may appear contradictory, it seems that the current situation may warrant a new rationale for foreign language study. The new theory might include parts of the first two theoretical categories mentioned by Bourque. New goals in foreign languages might be both communication and cultural study.

The rationale for studying a foreign language has usually been clouded with inconsequential reasons. Students in secondary schools in particular have been encouraged to take a foreign language "if you want to go to college," or "because knowing a foreign language is the hallmark of a

well-educated man." In both cases there has been little need to acquire more than "knowing a second language." These reasons were inadequate when they were first put forth and they are inadequate today.

Poulin has enumerated other obsolete reasons for studying foreign languages as: 1) the need for people trained in foreign languages in the business world, 2) the need for foreign relations specialists, 3) increased tourism, and 4) military personnel stationed around the world (30:288).

These certainly are acceptable reasons for foreign language study--but they are not sufficient reasons. If foreign languages are to continue to be a meaningful part of the school curriculum, more immediate benefits to the students' development are going to have to be shown.

Ours is a pluralistic society but we must realize that there are no superior cultures or civilizations. A study of foreign languages can help to bring cultures into contrast and to give an objective look at those other than our own.

In undertaking a study of a people through their language, the most important single factor is the teacher. Poulin has stated that the good teacher brings to the classroom his command of the language and his knowledge of the culture. He is a cultural island in the classroom. Full

appreciation of the people and their language is gained because of the way in which the languages are taught. Poulin was emphatic when he said that they not only spoke about the language and the people, they spoke the language as well.

The fate of the modern foreign language program in schools today will depend in great part on the quality of the instructional personnel and the relevancy of the goals which they have set for their students. These two factors should in turn determine which methods will be employed to reach those foreign language objectives.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify certain factors which influence the attitudes of Florida modern foreign language teachers toward contemporary teaching methodology. The study focused on the use of two instruments which yielded data relative to the modern foreign language teachers' beliefs and factors in their professional and personal experiences which affect those beliefs.

It was believed that the findings of this study would prove useful to those who are involved in training modern foreign language teachers and also provide a basis for further research. Hutchinson has shown that significant changes in the practices of teachers can be made through professional development activities (16:61).

Need for the Study

The contemporary method of teaching modern foreign languages has shown very positive results where it has been used with realistic and relevant objectives. This was true in spite of the publicity afforded such studies as the Keating report and the Pennsylvania Studies (see Chapter II). Many teachers have continued to use a traditional approach. Large numbers of these teachers had received training (some had been participants in NDEA Foreign Language Institutes) in the use of contemporary methods but still chose to practice a traditional method. Some explanations were needed as to why a proven method in which teachers were trained was being rejected quite strenuously in some cases.

Rivers has shown that "it is the teacher's objectives which determine the way he approaches the organization of his language lesson" (31:39). It would seem that a simple but solid approach to the teaching of modern foreign languages would be to list according to priority both short- and long-range objectives and to utilize those techniques which best aid the achievement of those objectives. In the past many teachers have not taken this very basic approach to their planning and the result has been confusion in their goals, attitudes and teaching philosophy.

Some of the reasons for teachers failing to use this fundamental approach probably lies in their attitudes toward the teaching strategies. If these attitudes are related to factors in a teacher's personal professional background and training, the significance of these relationships should be studied with great scrutiny by those who plan both pre-service and in-service educational programs for modern foreign language teachers.

Methodological training, as offered in the NDEA Institutes, in modern languages in the past has stressed the introduction and presentation of the contemporary method on its own merit. This has not proved to be sufficient. Most pre-service and post-service teachers have begun their training with preconceived ideas and attitudes based on their own experiences and training. The need has been to try to identify factors that were related to the development of these attitudes in the hope that some of them could be changed if they were in conflict with what was generally accepted as desired and relevant modern foreign language instructional objectives. A revision of methods of presenting contemporary instructional approaches might lead to a more relevant curriculum in foreign language education and to a better understanding of the objectives that are held for the different approaches to modern language instruction.

Definition of Terms

Traditional:--a grammar-translation method of foreign language instruction with emphasis on reading, translating and writing the target language. This method is also called the "cognitive-code" approach.

Contemporary:--the audiolingual method of instruction which stresses the listening and speaking facets of the language while following the instructional sequence of listening, speaking, reading and writing. This method which usually employs the use of some type of language laboratory equipment is sometimes called the "new key."

Language laboratory:

--described by Stack as "a special room designed and used primarily for modern foreign language learning with the aid of electronic equipment. The purpose of the equipment is to enable the student to hear the program material with utmost clarity and high fidelity" (34:3).

--defined by Hayes as "a classroom or other area containing electronic and mechanical equipment designed and arranged to make foreign language learning more effective" (13:70).

--the author of this study defines the language laboratory as any instructional space equipped with good-quality listening equipment designed to enhance foreign

language learning. Recording equipment may or may not be included. Portable tape recorders would fit the above description.

Procedure

A 10 percent random sample was taken from Florida's approximately 1,000 modern foreign language teachers. These teachers responded to a questionnaire (FLTQ) and scale of beliefs (FLSB). The data gathered from the scale were analyzed by a factor analysis. This treatment resulted in five factors evolving from the FLSB. These five factors were then correlated by standard statistical procedures with the items on the FLTQ.

The instruments used in this study were created by the author and checked for reliability using professional teachers and teacher trainees in a test-retest (see Chapters III and IV). Procedural details are discussed in Chapter III.

Questions for Study

The questions examined by this study are:

1. Which of the items in the Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire are associated with receptiveness by Florida modern foreign language teachers to the contemporary method of teaching foreign languages and to using the language laboratory?

2. What is the correlation of the factors of the Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs to the items of the Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire?

3. What are the implications of the findings for modern foreign language teacher training activities?

Statement of Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference at the .05 level between the five factor scores of the FLSB and the manner in which the respondents learned the second language if not a native speaker of the second language. (See item seven on the FLTQ, Appendix A)

2. There is no significant difference at the .05 level between the five factor scores of the FLSB and the way in which the respondents experienced training in the use of the language laboratory. (See item eight on the FLTQ, Appendix A)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Historical Aspects of the Problem

Although Bourque has mentioned three modern-day theories of foreign language teaching, most instructional techniques today fall into one of two major categories: the traditional, or grammar-translation method, and the audiolingual method, or contemporary approach.

The traditional method had its beginnings in the early study of the classical languages. This method has been traced to Donatus who composed a Latin primer as early as the fourth century (2:9). From similar reading-based materials in the classical languages Michel de Montaigne suggested the "natural" method based on the way a person learns his own tongue without the use of rules or books. John Locke proposed a similar approach in which he said that the language should be "talked into" the learner.

Many variations of the natural method were used during the ensuing years. In the nineteenth century Gottlieb Heness and Lambert Saveur introduced a more systematic

approach to this method in which the spoken language was stressed. This method was in all probability the forerunner of the Army Specialized Training Program developed during World War II.

Johaann Meidenger devised a method of instruction based on the memorization of rules and tedious translation from one language to another. This led Wilhelm Viëtor to develop the "direct" method in the latter half of the nineteenth century. When Max Walter introduced this method into the United States in 1911 it required a highly qualified and energetic teacher. It also demanded the use of visual aids and oral procedures as the basis for conversation.

The twentieth century brought efforts by the professional organizations to change the approaches to foreign language instruction. The Modern Language Association in 1898 suggested the use of several different methods based on the age of the students. The natural method which used the target language in describing everyday objects was advised for younger children. Older students were started on the direct method at first and then ended their study with emphasis on reading and grammar.

In the 1920s most schools were only offering two year sequences of foreign languages. With the approaches that were in use at that time and the short sequences of study,

it was obvious that the results were a generation of students who could neither read, write nor speak the language they had studied beyond the most elementary level.

World War II brought a critical need for persons who were fluent in foreign languages. These needs were varied and ranged from those of a diplomatic nature to those of military intelligence. In order to get the skilled personnel it needed, the military set up its own training programs. Best known of these was the Army Specialized Training Program which used intensive study in second language learning utilizing native speakers of the target language in a "total immersion" approach for relatively short periods of time.

After the war there seemed to be little need for foreign language skills. The newer methods of teaching called for smaller classes when schools and colleges were inundated with returning servicemen. The curriculum being advocated at this time for secondary schools did not include foreign languages and this also added to the decline of interest in language study. Those schools and colleges that did retain foreign language programs began to expand their facilities to include language laboratories to aid in the development of the new methods.

During the 1950s a resurgence of interest in foreign language study was brought about by a number of studies. One of these studies conducted by the Modern Language Association resulted in a "Program Policy" which included the following statement regarding the values of foreign language study:

The student should acquire a set of skills that could result in real mastery of the language if practiced long enough; he should gain a new understanding of language, his own as well as the foreign language; and he should begin to develop the concept of differences between cultures through expanded knowledge of the foreign country and the likenesses and dissimilarities between its civilization and that of the United States.

The MLA Program Policy and a position paper of the National Association of Secondary School Principals both expressed the same philosophy as to the order in which foreign language study should proceed--listening and speaking the target language and then reading and writing it--with all new material in the foreign language study sequence taken in this order (1:9-15).

Russia's launching of Sputnik I in 1957 was, indirectly, a great boost for foreign languages at that time. That timely event coupled with criticisms of the American educational system in general by outstanding citizens such as Admiral Hyman Rickover and James Conant caused the Congress to act on strong educational measures. The National Defense

Education Act of 1958 brought about great changes in the emphasis of foreign language study methods. Summer and academic-year institutes were designed primarily to introduce modern foreign language teachers to the "new key" in foreign language education. This was the term being used by many institute instructors to describe the audiolingual method. This method placed much more emphasis on the listening-speaking aspects of the target language. For this reason most of the participants in the institutes were experienced teachers who were selected in order to update their training in foreign language methodology and to improve their audiolingual skills as well. Native speakers played an important role in these institutes by providing stimulating and intensive oral practice in the target language. They also served as cultural informants to the institute participants.

The stage was set for the next 10 years as the NDEA Institutes continued to produce teachers who had been exposed to the new teaching method. These institutes introduced the participants to such innovations in methodology as pattern practice or structure drills, and use of the language laboratory. The electronic language laboratory consequently came into vogue as the principal teaching and learning aid in audiolingually oriented modern foreign language classes.

During these years of growth in popularity of the contemporary teaching method proponents of the traditional method did not give in easily. Opponents criticized audiolingual instruction for producing students who could only "parrot" what they had heard. Others said it was too repetitious and boring, and that structure and vocabulary depth were sacrificed in order to emphasize perfection in intonation and pronunciation. Language teachers took sides in the controversy based on their method preference. Eclectics took what they liked of both methods and usually did not do justice to either with their approaches. Researchers soon were making comparative studies of the contemporary and traditional methodologies. These studies ranged from use and non-use of the language laboratory to teacher proficiency and student achievement. Many of these studies supported the contemporary method regarding modern objectives and rationale for foreign language study. Other research showed little or no significance in the variables that were being measured.

The opposition to the audiolingual method of instruction by many members of the teaching profession caused this writer to think that some aspects of teacher attitude and philosophy might be related to acceptance or rejection of a method that had merit and was supported by research.

The Language Laboratory

The language laboratory has become the principal teaching and learning aid in the audiolingual approach to foreign language instruction. It is almost impossible to separate the two. When speaking of the audiolingual method of instruction in secondary schools it is assumed that some type of electronic broadcasting and listening equipment will be employed. For these reasons the following research cited may or may not mention both audiolingual method and the language laboratory.

Methodology and Student Achievement

Most recent research in foreign language teaching has been concerned with a comparison of teaching methods based on student achievement. One of the most ambitious of these experiments was that conducted by Scherer and Wertheimer (32:243-245). The subjects were students in a two-year college German program. These students were trained in either audiolingual classes or grammar-translation classes. In the former the subjects were taught spoken language skills through classroom and laboratory activities and the introduction of written materials in German was delayed for several weeks. At the end of one year the audiolingually trained students were found to be superior in listening and

speaking skills. The traditionally trained groups were significantly better in reading and writing skills. At the end of two years the differences between the two groups in listening and reading had almost disappeared. The audio-lingually trained students remained better in speaking and the traditionally trained were better in writing.

These experimenters were quick to point out that one conclusion can be drawn from these results: students learn whatever skills are emphasized in the instruction. They further observed that "the audiolingual method, whether its results are measured objectively or estimated by the students themselves, appeared to produce more desirable attitudes and better habituated direct association." For this reason the audiolingual method, which stressed all four skills, appeared to be the most comfortable even in cases where reading skill was the principal goal.

Two studies which have had negative overtones in foreign language instruction were one by Keating (18) which dealt with student use of the language laboratory and that by Smith and Baranyi (33). In the former Keating found that students from a group of New York high schools who used the language laboratory did not achieve as well as students who had not used it. John Carroll, writing in the 1969 Encyclopedia of Educational Research, pointed out that

Keating had been criticized from all quarters for methodological flaws in his experiment (7:214). He went on to explain that the Keating Report "is best interpreted as providing evidence that language laboratories have not in general been well or adequately utilized in high schools, partly because of deficiencies in teaching materials and procedures and partly because of student scheduling problems."

The Pennsylvania Studies

Much current discussion on research on foreign language teaching methodology has been focused on what is commonly referred to as the Pennsylvania Project, or the Pennsylvania Studies.

Smith and Baranyi conducted a large-scale experiment in 104 Pennsylvania secondary schools of all types and diverse geographic and socio-economic areas. Sixty-one French I and 43 German I classes were assigned to one of seven possible teaching strategy-language laboratory combinations: "traditional," "functional skills," or "functional skills plus grammar." Traditional here referred to the grammar-translation method; the functional skills referred to the contemporary or audiolingual method; and the third was an eclectic approach which used some of the traditional

grammar with the contemporary in what the authors called functional skills plus grammar. These approaches were coupled with one of the following language-laboratory systems: tape recorders, audio-active laboratories and audio-record laboratories. Class assignment was random in all respects. This study included 1,090 students the first year and was replicated the second year with approximately 700 students. These numbers made it one of the most extensive ever undertaken in foreign language research. This very fact, however, was detrimental to the validity of the study because of the difficulties involved in maintaining close controls over the participants (33).

The primary objectives of the study were to see if one of the three instructional approaches was better than the others and to see if one of the language laboratory systems was more effective than the others. More specifically, the project tried to determine which of three teaching strategies best accomplished the four objectives of the foreign language program in the secondary schools--listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing.

The authors concluded that there were no significant differences among the strategies on any of the skills except in reading where the traditional method showed better results. All results were measured on contemporary standardized tests.

The language laboratory systems showed no discernible effect on achievement when used twice weekly regardless of the type of laboratory system used.

Another pertinent conclusion in this study indicated that neither a teacher's experience in years and graduate education nor scores on the Modern Language Association Teacher Proficiency Tests are related to mean class achievement after either one or two years of study. This is contrary to Ackerman's study which stated "that students who have the benefits of a well qualified instructor will achieve greater language skills in the areas of listening, speaking, and especially writing. Low aptitude students also achieved better in reading by having a more highly qualified teacher" (1:63).

Comments on Pennsylvania Studies

Numerous articles have been written about the Pennsylvania Studies which were begun in 1966. Following are some of the pertinent comments by foreign language educational leaders regarding the project:

John Clark said "the reported major conclusion that after two years of 'traditional,' 'functional skills,' and 'functional skills plus grammar' instruction there were no significant differences in student achievement in listening

comprehension, speaking, and writing--and slight superiority of the 'traditional' group in reading was a rather disheartening outcome for the many persons who had placed their faith and developmental effort in the audiolingual approach" (8:388). Clark went on to show that the audiolingually trained students surpassed the control groups on tests of listening comprehension and speaking ability and usually with quite large mean differences in test score.

These studies were the most sophisticated and well-controlled experiments with large groups that were available in classroom research in foreign language learning. This statement did not deny a criticism of the studies from several points of view, but rather pointed to the studies as valid examples of research with educational questions.

One of the most important results of the studies indicated that the language laboratory used twice weekly had no effect upon learning with either fundamental skills or fundamental-skills grammar treatment. Furthermore, the traditional students achieved as well in listening and speaking without the laboratory. While these facts seemed disturbing, it must be considered that the laboratories were used only twice weekly for approximately 60 minutes total. It would be possible to argue that the full potential of the language laboratory for spaced practice in language learning was not evaluated in these investigations.

Rebecca Valette observed that in Pennsylvania at the time of the Study, as in the majority of schools across the nation, students received five contact hours per week in foreign languages, whether they spent five periods in their classroom or four periods in the classroom plus two half-periods in the language laboratory. Moreover, the teachers had been instructed to spend the laboratory period playing one tape to the entire class, rather than using the lab to individualize instruction by playing different tapes for specific groups of students. Under these conditions, it was not surprising that the study uncovered only random significant differences among the laboratory strategies and the tape-recorder-in-the-classroom technique. Future research should investigate the effectiveness of the laboratory when it is used to break the lock step pattern by providing materials for groups of varying abilities (35:400).

Valette also stated that we are going to have to investigate, in greater detail, the relationship between teacher proficiency and teacher competence. She said we are still not certain which factors determine teacher competence, that is, the teacher's ability to guide students to predetermined levels of achievement.

Elton Hocking has commented:

The (language) laboratory is a highly complex piece of electronic engineering. . . . The educational advantages have been found overwhelmingly worthwhile in hundreds of studies. "Hundreds of studies" is doubtless an exaggeration, but the discrediting of the language laboratory by the Pennsylvania Project is even more questionable. Hundreds of teachers, surely, have witnessed the value of laboratory practice when it is well done; perhaps an equal number have been disappointed as a result of poor planning or execution. Either experience can be documented and "proven." The limitations of the language laboratory are tightly bound to the teacher's basic theoretical and methodological orientation toward language learning, and to the use of practice materials which reflect the goals of the schools' program. In brief, if the teacher is good and knows what he wants his students to achieve, and has a technically good installation and materials to match, the language laboratory works, and produces better results than would be possible without it. (15:404)

Frank Otto indicated that the validity of the Pennsylvania Studies was being increasingly questioned by educational psychologists and curriculum specialists. He concluded that we must have better research regarding the processes of learning a foreign language (27:420).

"In brief," John Carroll said, "these studies seem to tell us that the 'audiolingual' emphasis on current FL teaching philosophy is in some way misguided" (7:236).

To these comments Birksmaier and Lange added this:

The Pennsylvania Studies have not provided any new answers in regards to language teaching. They have mainly illustrated an inappropriate use

of the language laboratory in teaching language skills and the inability of the profession to produce one set of teaching strategies that clearly contrasts with another set. Furthermore, the studies have indicated the absolute necessity for closer evaluation of individual strategies, procedures, and techniques in the learning of foreign language. In that light, the studies are not a threat, but an indication of some of the tasks that still remain ahead for the profession. (4:50)

The Pennsylvania Studies have been discussed at length in this section primarily because of the impact that some of the findings probably will have on foreign language education. Smith and Baranyi were the first to admit that the research conducted by the project was imperfect.

It should be remembered that these studies, in some ways, have struck at the heart of the audiolingual purists. Those who had been instrumental in developing and implementing the "new key" of foreign language teaching felt that their world was under attack. These leaders immediately took the defensive and began to look for flaws in the organization and administration of the project. Some were found because, as the authors had admitted, the study was not free of fault. Some of the criticism was justified; the time length sequences and frequency of use of the language laboratory should have been varied and included several different schedules for comparison. As it was, one can only assume that 30 minutes twice weekly in the

laboratory produced no significant difference in student performance.

The real significance that these studies had for modern foreign language education was this--the contemporary method of teaching foreign languages had not provided all of the results that many of its proponents had predicted. And, by the same token, all that the studies had concluded as not being significantly meaningful should not be taken as meaningless. The true value of these reports was that they had warned the profession that all was not well in foreign language educational methods and that some changes must be forthcoming if the discipline was to remain a relevant and significant part of the curriculum.

Other Pertinent Studies

More positive results have been obtained in a study by Lorge who investigated the effects of the language laboratory on foreign language learning. The experiment was conducted with 713 high school French students participating on the 1st-3rd-year levels (20:409-419).

Using control and experimental groups she found that:

- (1) In pronunciation all laboratory groups made greater progress than nonlaboratory groups.

(2) In listening comprehension the laboratory groups made significantly greater gains than the nonlaboratory groups.

(3) No significant differences were found in written skills.

Maynes conducted an 18-week experiment to test the effectiveness of the audiolingual method of instruction and use of the language laboratory. The subjects were Arizona high school students. The experiment group memorized unwritten dialogues; grammar was taught in relation to the dialogues and reinforced by pattern drills; the laboratory was used as an aid in overlearning and the emphasis was on speaking and understanding. The control group received traditional training in which reading and writing were stressed. The experimental group demonstrated enthusiasm and active participation above and beyond that of the control group. The tabulated results of the examinations used to test the subjects in the four fundamental abilities in Spanish--reading, writing, speaking and listening--showed the experimental group to have outscored the control group by a considerable margin (22:140).

Other studies have involved variables such as number of student stations in the laboratory and the degree of sophistication of the laboratory equipment. A study by

Leidy found no significant differences in achievement of students involved with the above-mentioned variables (19).

Most of the recent research in this area has shown more positive than negative results from the use of the audio-lingual method and the use of the language laboratory. These efforts have been focused on student achievement results.

Dodd stated that

some language teachers are baffled by the recommendation of emphasizing speaking and understanding the foreign language. They believe that language teachers have been doing this for years. Nevertheless, we find men and women enrolling in adult education classes throughout the city (New York) because they did not develop these skills in high school or college. Class time was spent translating and memorizing the conjugations of verbs. The methods in vogue in the past did not prove effective, and students showed little interest in the study of a foreign language. This statement may be disputed, but how many persons, other than language teachers, could discuss this topic, or any other, in a foreign language that was studied in school? Foreign language habits are formed through practice, correction, and more practice. The language laboratory and audiolingual method were developed after it became obvious that traditional methods did not provide adequately for the development of audiolingual skills. (10:71-72)

Hocking said that the average teacher has not been able to cope simultaneously with the new methods, the new mechanical devices and the new materials which have been presented to him all at once. The fatigue problem in teaching is great, and the additional demands created by audiolingual teaching are very serious (14:85).

McKim pointed out that

the question of whether language laboratories can improve the quality of language learning has been resolved. Most secondary schools possess some form of language laboratory, and studies including the use of control groups show that their proper use markedly improves pronunciation, intonation, and the listening and speaking skills in general. As long as these skills remain high on our priority list, language laboratories or their equivalents will be indispensable to a foreign language program. (25:454)

In another article McKim related:

For the last seventeen years, the use of the language laboratory as an aid in the instruction of foreign language has passed through the stages of zealous acceptance and outright rejection. Now there is growing conviction that the language laboratory has its place in foreign language instruction when used according to sound pedagogical principles. (24:452)

McArdle, in reviewing the section on Teacher Education in the Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education, mentioned the following:

Banathy (3:491) cites the need for a description of the in-class performance of language teachers that will necessarily be more specific than the out-of-class performance stated in Paquette (28:424-431). Recently attempts have been made by Politzer and Bartley (29:268) to describe what the language teacher actually does in specific situations and by Mackey (21:268) to find and identify specific teacher behaviors. (23:262)

Observational Systems

Jarvis conducted an experiment at Purdue University in which an observational instrument for foreign language

instruction was devised. This instrument was based on a system of classroom teacher-student interaction (17:335-341).

A model theoretically and experientially based on an ideal average frequency for the various behaviors of the observational instrument was postulated for a teaching situation. Fourteen graduate teaching assistants in French at Purdue University were ranked according to their effectiveness as judged by their superiors. They were ranked three times. A teacher profile was prepared on each teacher based on deviation scores. Correlations ranged from .8275 to .9047 and there is reason to believe that this instrument did record behaviors which differentiate degrees of what was judged as effectiveness. Significant aspects of teaching behavior seemed to be recorded.

This study was a milestone in measurement of language skill. In this experiment the instrument was used but for one purpose. It appeared to have other possibilities. The very use of such instruments may have been a causal factor in behavior change.

Moskowitz used several observational systems including FLint (Foreign Language Interaction) with groups of pre-service and in-service foreign language teachers. The teachers were taught the systems; then they filled out questionnaires and were observed.

Findings indicated that the pre-service teachers:

- 1) had more positive attitudes toward teaching;
- 2) used more indirect teaching patterns in grammar and conversation lessons;
- 3) had more negative attitudes toward their cooperating teachers; and
- 4) were perceived more favorably by the pupils in their classes.

In-service teachers in a graduate course were subjected to micro-teaching segments. Activities were aimed at sensitizing participants to the influence of teacher behavior in students. Responses to their questionnaires after they had returned to work indicated that they felt that studying observational systems had influenced them to make many desirable changes in their teaching, causing them to feel more confident and competent in their classroom interaction (26:218-235).

Summary

The research reviewed indicated:

- 1.. Most research on foreign language methodology was a comparison of teaching methods as they related to student achievement. A high proportion of these have shown positive results.

2. Two important studies in the past decade have shown negative results regarding contemporary teaching methodology. Both studies have been attacked by audiolingual proponents for having methodological flaws.

3. Most current discussions have centered on the Pennsylvania Project. These studies have indicated that a reexamination of strategies, techniques and procedures in learning foreign languages is necessary.

4. Other related studies have dealt with the manner in which teaching behavior and attitudes toward teaching have been measured.

5. There appears to have been no research studies which have been concerned with the attitudes of foreign language teachers toward teaching methodology.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Limitation of the Study

This was an attitudinal study and it was limited to the secondary modern foreign language teachers of the state of Florida.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was the approximately one thousand modern foreign language teachers in the secondary schools in the state of Florida.

Two samples totaling approximately 10 percent of the population were taken. The first sampled at random the modern foreign language registrants at the 1970 Annual Conference of the Florida Foreign Language Association in Orlando, Florida. The second was collected by a direct mail procedure. Two samples were taken so that, if desired, a comparison could be made between conference participants and nonparticipants. However, because of the nature of the findings of the study this comparison was not made. Thereafter the two samples were treated as a composite one.

During registration at the Florida Foreign Language Association Conference those registrants who were modern foreign language teachers were asked to complete the Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire (FLTQ) and the Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs (FLSB). Sixty-nine of the 90 secondary modern foreign language teachers who were asked to fill out the two instruments returned the completed instrument to this writer. This resulted in a 76.6 percent return.

The direct mail portion of the sample was taken by randomly selecting 27 Florida counties so that there was a proportionate balance according to county size based on school population. The 1970-71 Florida Educational Directory was used in choosing 68 schools from the 27 counties so that the sample contained schools from 17 small counties, 6 medium-sized counties and 4 large counties. The county-size categories were arbitrarily set in order to have a representative sample on a state-wide basis according to school population (9).

Copies of the FLTQ and FLSB were mailed to the heads of the foreign language departments of each of the 68 schools on the basis of one copy of the instrument for each 30 teachers in that school based on statistics reported in the 1970-71 Florida Educational Directory. Three large

schools, each with more than 150 teachers, were sent five copies of the two instruments. No other schools were sent more than four copies. Many of the smaller schools were sent only one copy. Up-to-date sources of data which would have made it possible to have known precisely how many foreign language instructional units there were in each of the schools used in this survey were not available. Consequently no percent of returns on this portion of the sample could be calculated. Fifty-four completed instruments were received from the 27 counties after two follow-up letters had been sent at two-week intervals following the initial mailing. The total sample numbered 123. Cover letters which told of the importance of the study and which gave additional information were included in the mailings (see Appendix C).

Instrumentation

Two instruments were developed and evaluated by this investigator:

- 1) The Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire (FLTQ) (see Appendix A) consisted of 13 items and was designed to gather information from the respondents concerning their personal, educational and professional background and experiences. This instrument identified the subject

according to sex, age, teaching level, years of teaching experience and professional training and experience.

2) The Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs (FLSB) (see Appendix B) contained 50 statements about modern foreign language teaching philosophy and methodology. The respondents were able to indicate on this scale how strongly they agreed or disagreed with each statement. The statements were concerned with approximately 18 different concepts.

The format of the scale was patterned after the Florida Scale of Civic Beliefs developed by Dr. R. B. Kimbrough and Dr. V. A. Hines. Content of the scale was based, in part, on the "new key" audiolingual method of modern foreign language instruction as described by Nelson Brooks in Language and Language Learning (6).

Both the FLTQ and the FLSB were printed on a single sheet for use in this study. Both were critiqued by graduate education students and practicing classroom teachers. These examiners offered criticisms concerning clarity of content and format.

Originally the FLSB contained 64 statements. After careful examination by several teachers and graduate students the scale was reduced to 50 items by eliminating those statements which were not clear to the reader. The 50-item scale was then administered in a test-retest of reliability

to a group of 28 foreign language education professionals. The test-retest showed a reliability of .7554. This test group consisted of both practicing modern foreign language teachers and modern foreign language education students at the University of Florida. The second administration of the instrument was made within three weeks of the first.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is a method for analyzing the inter-correlations of many variables and separating and reducing these variables into correlational patterns which permit inferences to be made concerning the nature of the construct involved. In short, factor analysis allows a somewhat simple view of what had been a complex picture before the analysis.

Guertin and Bailey describe factor analysis as:

that which permits examination of a matrix expressing the correlations of each variable with every other variable. In a sense, factor analysis is a formal decision making process to explicate subsets of covarying variables no matter how numerous they may be. (12:1)

Data from the FLTQ and FLSB for the 123 respondents were punched onto data processing cards. All computing was done with the IBM 360/65 computer at the University of Florida Computing Center. The FLSB data were then put through a University of Florida Educational Evaluation

Library program (EEL501 - Varimax-factor analysis). This produced the means, standard deviations and rotated orthogonal factor loadings for the 50 items on the scale. Factor loadings are the weights which the Varimax program used to estimate variable scores from factors. Factor loadings are highly correlated with the item weights for computing factor scores. The factor loadings in this study are based on the correlations between items of the FLSB. For example, the higher the number of the factor loading the stronger the factor loading. A high factor loading (.60 or better) means that the particular item of the FLSB is measuring, essentially, what that factor is measuring.

The discussion here on Varimax rotations and factor loadings has its base in geometric representations and matrix algebra. A more detailed explanation and treatment of this aspect of factor analysis may be found in Introduction to Modern Factor Analysis (12).

Several Varimax rotations were made for this study. During each rotation the Varimax program added another factor giving the items of the FLSB one more position into which they might fall. After each rotation a close look was taken at the means, standard deviations and the factor loadings. If an item had a weak factor loading (below .40) and an extremely high or low mean and standard deviation it

was examined to see how it related to the factor groupings from a nonstatistical point of view. If it appeared from this analysis that the item was weak it was dropped and another rotation was made. This process limited the number of factor groups where an item could fall.

A Varimax solution was finally chosen in which 32 items had been rotated and in which those 32 items had fallen into 12 factor categories. Further analysis of these factor loadings revealed that seven of the factors were weak. Using a loading cutoff figure of .40 some of the factors contained only one or two items of .40 or better. Other factors loaded on more than two items with .40 or better but the nonstatistical relationship was not considered good enough to retain and use them for further analysis.

Using a process of elimination five factors which loaded at .40 or better on at least two items were selected for further analyses. These five factors were among those with the highest number of item loadings with figures of .40 or better. These factors also had strong relationships of a nonstatistical nature in that most of the items loading on a factor were closely related to each other from a common sense point of view. For example, all of the items which loaded on Factor 1 (Language Laboratory) were strongly related to use of language laboratories.

The five factors chosen for further study were given the following descriptive names based on the nature of the items which loaded on these factors: (The numbers below each factor refer to specific items from the FLSB which loaded on these factors.)

1. Use of the Language Laboratory (L.L.)
12, 23, 34, 49
2. Early Age of the Learner (Early Age)
2, 25
3. Background for Foreign Language Study (Background)
21, 33, 50
4. Use of English in the Classroom (English)
10, 31, 43, 45
5. Methods and Techniques of Instruction (Methods)
3, 6, 17, 30, 46.

The Varimax (EEL501) computer program generated a primary factor matrix and a principal axes matrix. These matrices were punched onto data processing cards by the Varimax program. These data programmed with the responses from the FLSB and the EEL518--Factor Scores computer program produced a matrix of factor scores for the 50 items of the FLSB.

Guertin and Bailey have stated:

The rationale for obtaining factor scores is analogous to obtaining a total score for a person on a test that has been item analyzed to yield biserial r validity indices between total score and the items. An item-loading on a factor can be

thought of as a validity coefficient correlating the item and that reference factor and analogous to the biserial r between an item and total score in item analysis. (12:192-193)

In essence, the factor scores are used in lieu of the values which would be generated by a biserial r between items and total score in an item analysis.

The factor scores obtained by the above-described procedure were then used in several statistical treatments described in the section on Results.

Results

A point biserial correlation (r_{pb}) is described by Glass and Stanley as:

One variable yields nominal-dichotomous measures, the other yields interval or ratio measures. In these cases one variable is measured dichotomously (e.g., sex) and the measurement of the other variable produces a collection of scores with interval or ratio properties. (11:163)

Nominal-dichotomous measurement means something is present or it is missing. The data are 0's and 1's.

Examples: male (1) - female (0); under age 30(1) - over age 30(0). Interval measurement indicates that a unit of measurement exists, e.g., mile, hour, pound, etc. Any real number may result from this act of measurement, and differences between scores reflect on the differences in amount of the characteristic possessed.

In this study a natural dichotomy existed in items 1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of the FLTQ. These items were answered with either male-female or yes-no. A point biserial correlation of these items with the five factor scores of the FLSB did not yield any statistical significance at the .05 level of confidence. Table 1 shows these point biserial correlation coefficients.

Glass and Stanley have described the biserial correlation (r_{bis}) as:

one variable yields forced dichotomous measures with an underlying normal distribution, the other yields interval or ratio measures.

The biserial correlation coefficient is an estimate of the product moment correlation between X and the normally distributed scores on Y that are assumed to underlie the dichotomous (0 or 1) scores.

The data gathered for the computation of r_{bis} consist of an X score, which can be any one of several different values, and a Y score, which is either 0 or 1, for each of n persons. (11:168)

The term biserial refers to the fact that there are two series of persons being observed on X: those that scored 0 on Y and those who scored 1 on Y. The expression product-moment biserial is sometimes used instead of point biserial (11:163).

Items 2, 4 and 5 of the FLTQ dealt with age, years of teaching experience and degree held by each respondent. The five possible responses in each of these three items were forced into a dichotomy which provided as nearly as possible

TABLE 1
Point Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between
Factors of the FLSB and Items of the FLTQ

ITEMS	FACTORS				Methods--	
	Language Laboratory Use	Early Age of Learner	Background for Foreign Language Study	Use of English in Classroom	Techniques of Instruction	
Sex	(1)** 0.0635	0.0239	.0627	-.0922		-.1262
Native Speaker	(6)** 0.1098	-0.0106	.0820	-.0549		.0433
NDEA I	(9)** 0.1129	-0.0272	-.0521	-.1113		.0344
NDEA II	(10)** -0.0077	0.0190	-.0681	-.0033		.0860
EXTFP	(11)** -0.0165	-0.0523	.0002	-.0169		.1519#
Foreign College Study	(12)** -0.1151	0.1241	-.0221	.0417		-.0357
Methods Workshop	(13)** 0.0788	-0.0503	.0537	.0328		-.1107

**Refers to item number on FLTQ (see Appendix A)

#Highest coefficient was not significant at the .05 level

a 50-50 division. These divisions caused age to be divided into--35 years and under--36 and over; experience--5 years and under--6 years and over; and degree--bachelor's degree or less--master's or above.

Biserial correlations were then computed using a biserial correlation program (EEL541) between the three dichotomous FLTQ items and the five factor scores. A similar lack of statistical significance was found after examination of the biserial coefficients obtained from this program. These biserial coefficients are shown in Table 2.

Items 7 and 8 of the FLSB dealt with the manner in which the respondent learned the second language if he was not a native speaker of that language and with the nature of the respondent's experiences in using the language laboratory. Neither of these items were suited to dichotomization and correlation with a biserial treatment. Items 7 and 8 were then checked for significant difference in an analysis of variance.

Analysis of variance is the statistical device which answers the question: Is the variability between groups large enough compared to the variability within groups to infer that the means of the populations from which the different groups were drawn are not all the same? We might say that if the variability between group means is great

TABLE 2

Biserial Correlation Coefficients Between Factors
of the FLSB and Items of the FLTQ

ITEMS	FACTORS				Factor Score 4 (Use of English)	Factor Score 5 (Methods/ Techniques)
	Factor Score 1 Language Laboratory	Factor Score 2 (Age of Learner)	Factor Score 3 (Back- ground)			
Age (2)**	0.0393	-0.0375	0.0961	-0.1533#	-0.0146	
Years of foreign language teaching experience (4)**	-0.0563	0.0070	0.0058	-0.2428#	-0.1614	
Highest degree held (5)**	-0.0465	0.0116	0.0655	-0.1255#	0.0353	

**Refers to item number on FLTQ (see Appendix A)

#Highest coefficient was not significant at the .05 level

enough they probably came from different populations and that there is a statistically significant difference present in the data. The test for giving this answer is the F-ratio:

$$F = \frac{\text{Between Group Variance}}{\text{Within Group Variance}}$$

F-ratios of 1.4 and 1.9 respectively were the high figures for items 7 and 8 of the FLTQ. In order to be statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence an F-ratio of 2.7 was needed on item 7 and 2.4 needed on item 8. Significance levels were derived from standard conversion tables in Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Tables 3 and 4 show the F-ratios for items 7 and 8 (11).

The null hypotheses which stated that there were no significant differences at the .05 level in the responses to items 7 and 8 of the FLTQ and the five factor scores cannot be rejected based on the F-ratios which were found.

Up to this point no statistical significance had been found by using frequently used standard statistical measures, e.g., biserial correlation, point biserial correlation and analysis of variance. Significance was also sought by using the sums of the factor scores of each respondent with the previously mentioned standard statistical measures. The results were also extremely weak. Most

TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance in Item Seven of the FLTQ--
How the Second Language Was Learned--Using the
Factor Scores of the FLSB

		Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio
Factor Score 1 (Language Laboratory)	Between Groups	1.7430	4	0.4358	
	Within Groups	113.8406	92	1.2374	0.3522#
	Total	115.5836	96		
Factor Score 2 (Age of Learner)	Between Groups	7.3124	4	1.8281	
	Within Groups	199.9149	92	2.1730	0.8413#
	Total	207.2272	96		
Factor Score 3 (Background for f.l. study)	Between Groups	3.0234	4	0.7559	
	Within Groups	209.4355	92	2.2765	0.3320#
	Total	212.4589	96		
Factor Score 4 (Use of English)	Between Groups	1.4142	4	0.3536	
	Within Groups	66.8972	92	0.7271	0.4862#
	Total	68.3115	96		
Factor Score 5 (Methods/ Techniques)	Between Groups	4.5782	4	1.1446	
	Within Groups	74.3883	92	0.8086	1.4155#
	Total	78.9665	96		

#Not significant at the .05 level

TABLE 4

Analysis of Variance in Item Eight of the FLTQ--
Experience with the Language Laboratory--
Using the Factors of the FLSB

		Sum of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F Ratio
Factor Score 1 (Language Laboratory)	Between Groups	2.9805	4	0.7451	
	Within Groups	148.0206	118	1.2544	0.5940#
	Total	151.0011	122		
Factor Score 2 (Age of Learner)	Between Groups	5.1994	4	1.299	
	Within Groups	302.8127	118	2.5662	0.5065#
	Total	308.0120	122		
Factor Score 3 (Background for f.l. study)	Between Groups	10.3019	4	2.5755	
	Within Groups	267.2371	118	2.2647	1.1372#
	Total	277.5388	122		
Factor Score 4 (Use of English)	Between Groups	5.4720	4	1.3680	
	Within Groups	83.3867	118	0.7067	1.9359#
	Total	88.8587	122		
Factor Score 5 (Methods/ Techniques)	Between Groups	1.1337	4	0.2834	
	Within Groups	92.8488	188	0.7869	0.3602#
	Total	93.9825	122		

#Not significant at the .05 level

correlations fell below .10. A last attempt at obtaining significance was made by trying to build up the multiple R's using a stepwise regression program (BMD02R--Health Sciences Computing Facility, UCLA). This program produced a sequence of multiple linear regression equations in stepwise fashion. One variable at a time was added to the regression equation. This procedure resulted in the program performing an analysis of variance and then computing the F-ratios. The stepwise sequence was continued until the program could no longer perform its computations due to the inadequacy of the F-ratio. During the course of this program no multiple R of more than .32 was reached.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was conceived and developed by the author because it was believed that there were factors in a teacher's personal and professional background which might influence his attitudes toward modern language instructional methods.

Specifically, the study has sought answers to the following questions:

1. Which of the items in the FLTQ are associated with receptiveness by Florida modern foreign language teachers to the contemporary method of teaching foreign languages and to using the language laboratory?
2. What is the correlation of the factors of the FLSB to the items of the FLTQ?
3. What are the implications of the findings for modern foreign language teacher training activities?

This study was limited to the modern foreign language teachers of the state of Florida. A survey was made of more than 10 percent of the population and included teachers

from various-sized schools in 27 counties throughout the state. A 50-item scale (FLSB) was filled out by the 123 respondents along with a 13-item questionnaire (FLTQ). The scale was factor analyzed and reduced to five factors. These factors were then examined with the items of the FLTQ through correlational studies and analyses of variance.

The standard measures of relationships between items of the FLTQ and factors of the FLSB indicated no significance at the .05 level. A try at establishing some significance through a stepwise build-up of multiple R's also failed as no R beyond .32 could be obtained.

Conclusions

The study shows little evidence that a Florida modern foreign language teacher's background and experience as reported by the FLTQ have any significant relationship to his attitudes toward modern foreign language teaching methodology as measured by the FLSB.

The specific questions of this study may be answered in this manner:

1. None of the items in the FLTQ are significantly related to receptiveness by Florida modern foreign language teachers to the contemporary method of teaching foreign languages.
2. All of the correlations and analyses of the factors of the FLSB with the items of the FLTQ failed to reach statistical significance.

3. The implications of these findings for modern foreign language teacher training activities are limited. The study proposed that there were elements in a teacher's background and experience which were hypothesized to be influential as regards modern foreign language instructional attitudes and philosophy. This study does not support those hypotheses.

Specifically, it can be concluded from this study that the attitudes of Florida teachers toward modern foreign language teaching methodology are not significantly related to the following:

1. Sex of the teacher
2. Age of the teacher
3. The teacher's foreign language teaching experience
4. The academic degree which the teacher holds
5. Whether or not the teacher is a native speaker of the language which he teaches
6. How the teacher learned the second language if he is not a native speaker
7. The teacher's experience in learning to use the language laboratory
8. Whether or not the teacher has participated in:
 - a) NDEA Foreign Language Institutes
 - b) Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs
 - c) foreign language study at a foreign college or university
 - d) a workshop focused on recent foreign language teaching methods.

Implications

The most startling aspect of this study was the lack of statistical significance in the data analysis. One possible explanation for these findings was the fact that the overall reliability of .75 would mean a reliability of .60 for a test half as long and much lower reliabilities for the relatively short five factors used here. The reliability puts a ceiling on possible correlations with anything else.

A test-retest for reliability on the original 50-item FLSSB showed nine of the items with a coefficient of less than .40 (see Table 5). Five of these nine items were kept in the Varimax solution of 32 items from which the five factors were obtained. These items were retained on the basis of the factor loadings during the Varimax rotations but they may have exerted considerable influence on the intercorrelation coefficients of the factors.

If one assumes that the statistical deficiencies discussed above are not entirely responsible for the lack of significant differences found in this study, then the implications of these findings may well be surprising to those engaged in the training of modern foreign language teachers.

The Pennsylvania Studies have given warning that all is not well in modern foreign language education. The findings of the present study also indicate that some of those

TABLE 5

Test-Retest Reliability of the Items on the
Foreign Language Scale of Beliefs

Item	First Test		Second Test		r	Item	First Test		Second Test		r
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
1	1.607	0.772	1.536	0.731	.626	26	3.643	1.260	3.214	1.346	.656
2	2.000	0.845	1.893	0.976	.649	27	2.214	0.725	2.143	0.639	.474
3	2.036	1.017	1.929	0.842	.670	28	1.679	1.037	1.429	0.495	.199*
4	1.607	0.772	1.500	0.732	.727	29	3.000	1.165	3.000	1.195	.693
5	3.179	1.167	3.143	1.355	.549	30	2.214	1.013	2.107	0.900	.602
6	2.536	1.085	2.607	1.113	.500	31	2.500	1.052	2.286	1.030	.659
7	1.929	0.799	1.643	0.549	.349*	32	3.750	1.214	3.857	1.093	.754
8	1.500	0.500	1.393	0.488	.512	33	2.429	1.147	2.857	1.093	.505
9	3.750	0.871	3.607	1.175	.497	34	2.357	1.008	2.286	1.097	.683
10	1.964	1.085	1.929	1.067	.615	35	2.786	0.939	2.964	1.149	.721
11	1.857	0.789	1.893	1.012	.115*	36	4.107	0.817	4.071	0.842	.404
12	4.179	0.804	4.250	0.688	.629	37	4.179	0.758	4.071	0.923	.543
13	3.179	1.226	3.393	1.263	.669	38	2.000	0.886	2.143	1.059	.532
14	2.036	1.052	1.857	0.833	.536	39	1.786	0.674	2.036	0.778	.151*
15	3.964	1.085	3.929	1.132	.783	40	1.857	0.693	1.821	0.538	.219*
16	1.679	0.804	1.607	0.900	.023*	41	2.607	1.205	2.607	1.145	.846
17	2.000	0.964	2.036	1.117	.696	42	2.536	0.944	3.000	1.225	.772
18	3.036	1.117	3.214	1.206	.630	43	2.000	0.926	2.143	0.875	.353*
19	3.464	1.117	2.929	1.132	.337*	44	4.357	0.549	4.321	0.538	.458
20	1.679	0.538	1.893	0.724	.553	45	2.964	1.085	2.893	0.939	.662
21	3.893	0.976	3.821	0.889	.554	46	2.786	1.081	2.571	1.266	.716
22	1.964	0.566	2.143	1.025	-.114*	47	1.714	0.700	1.536	0.566	.567
23	2.893	1.047	2.893	1.012	.495	48	3.214	1.047	3.179	1.037	.622
24	4.643	0.479	4.750	0.433	.602	49	4.357	0.666	4.214	0.619	.768
25	4.429	0.863	4.464	0.823	.725	50	2.429	0.979	2.643	1.172	.445

* $r < .40$
n=28

activities which have been considered most beneficial in teacher training may need to be reexamined. Some of the more important questions raised by this study are:

- 1) How meaningful are the number of years of foreign language teaching experience as regards a teacher's attitude toward teaching methodology?
- 2) What does the academic degree which a teacher holds mean as far as his approach to modern foreign language instruction is concerned?
- 3) Is a teacher who is a native speaker of the language which he teaches any more receptive to a modern approach to foreign language study?
- 4) What can be done to increase a teacher's desire to use language laboratory equipment and to help him to look for new uses for this versatile teaching aid?
- 5) Do institutes, workshops and study abroad programs accomplish their objectives? Should these programs be more intensive, highly structured and evaluated on performance-based criteria?

This study appears to have raised more questions than it originally set out to answer. If future studies related to this one support the findings of this study then perhaps similar attitudinal studies toward teaching methodology might be examined in foreign language education as well as other disciplines.

These results should not be taken as a condemnation of all of the practices involved in modern foreign language teacher selection and training. It must, if we are to be pragmatic, cause us to take another look at some of the procedures, criteria for certification and approaches to methods study involved in preparing modern foreign language teachers for all teaching levels.

It is suggested that the study be replicated with the following structural changes:

--make the original scale (FLSB) longer for higher overall reliability. This should provide more items per factor in the factor analysis.

--conduct the same study with a sample and population from another geographic location.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Choose the response which best describes you and your background and experiences. Write the number of that response in the blank space to the left of each item.

- ____ 1. Sex
 (1) Male
 (2) Female
- ____ 2. Age
 (1) Under 25
 (2) 26-35
 (3) 36-45
 (4) 46-55
 (5) 56 or older
- ____ 3. What is your present teaching level?
 (1) Public secondary school
 (2) Private or parochial secondary school
 (3) Community or junior college (public)
 (4) Private 2 year college
 (5) Four year college or university
- ____ 4. Years of foreign language teaching experience
 (1) 2 years or less
 (2) 3 - 5 years
 (3) 6 - 10 years
 (4) 11 - 20 years
 (5) 21 or more years
- ____ 5. Highest degree that you hold
 (1) Less than a 4 year degree
 (2) Bachelors degree
 (3) Masters degree
 (4) 6th year degree
 (5) Doctors degree
- ____ 6. Are you a native speaker of the language that you teach?
 (1) Yes
 (2) No

APPENDIX A (continued)

- ____ 7. If you are not a native speaker of the language that you teach, how did you learn the second language?
- (1) In a traditional class - no language laboratory
 - (2) In a traditional class with language laboratory
 - (3) In an audiolingual class - no language laboratory
 - (4) In an audiolingual class with language laboratory
 - (5) I picked it up while living in a bi-lingual community
- ____ 8. Concerning the language laboratory and its use, which of the following statements best describe your experiences?
- (1) I have had no training in the use of the laboratory
 - (2) Another teacher showed me how to use the laboratory
 - (3) I attended a local workshop on its use
 - (4) My supervisor gave me training in its use
 - (5) A language laboratory manufacturer's representative conducted a workshop which I attended
- ____ 9. Have you participated in a Level I NDEA Foreign Language Institute?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
- ____ 10. Have you participated in a Level II NDEA Foreign Language Institute?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
- ____ 11. Have you participated in an Experienced Teacher Fellowship Program?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
- ____ 12. Have you had foreign language study at a foreign college or university?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No
- ____ 13. Have you attended a workshop focused on recent foreign language teaching methods?
- (1) Yes
 - (2) No

APPENDIX B

FOREIGN LANGUAGE SCALE OF BELIEFS

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Read each statement carefully; then select one of the five responses below; and next record the number that represents that particular response in the blank space to the left of each item.

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree

- ___ 1. The early stages of second language learning should be supported by exercises of guaranteed success in order to stimulate interest in foreign language study.
- ___ 2. Language learning becomes increasingly more difficult after the age of 12 - 14 years.
- ___ 3. A sustained experience in listening and speaking must precede training in reading and writing.
- ___ 4. Foreign language study should begin in the early elementary grades.
- ___ 5. Non use or minimal use of English in the foreign language class causes much wasted time.
- ___ 6. Direct translation from one language to another is of little importance in a modern foreign language class.
- ___ 7. The memorization and use of basic patterns and structures in the target language is essential if we are to provide students with the functional tools of the language.
- ___ 8. Learning a foreign language calls for the development of skills through practice and repetition.
- ___ 9. New methods of teaching foreign languages produce students who can only "parrot" that which they have memorized.

APPENDIX B (continued)

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree

- ___10. In the foreign language class the target language should be spoken rather than spoken about or discussed.
- ___11. The order in language learning of listening, speaking, reading, and writing is necessary for developing a functional foundation in the language.
- ___12. Language laboratories are a fad and will pass with time.
- ___13. One is not born with any special aptitude for foreign language learning.
- ___14. Learning a language concerns, not problem solving, but the formation and performance of habits.
- ___15. Children from homes where more than one language is spoken are below standard in English vocabulary because of bilingualism.
- ___16. All children should be given the opportunity to study a foreign language if they so desire.
- ___17. On the first level of language study "homework" should be limited to what the student is sure to do correctly and successfully.
- ___18. The second language should be established to the point that the mother tongue is not relinquished, but continues to accompany and dominate the complex fabric of language behavior.
- ___19. It's foolish to expect to achieve any semblance of near native fluency in two, three, or even four years of foreign language study in secondary schools.
- ___20. Mechanisms for recording and reproducing human voice sounds make the more arduous tasks of language learning more profitable and agreeable.

APPENDIX B (continued)

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree

- ___21. A student who is average or below in intelligence should be discouraged from studying a foreign language.
- ___22. Language achievement at the elementary grades level is limited in extent but is of a special quality not attainable later.
- ___23. The language laboratory has been the greatest teaching and learning device to date in modern language instruction.
- ___24. Language is something in a book.
- ___25. There are no sound reasons for beginning second language study before the 7th grade.
- ___26. One essential of language is that it have a written form and structure.
- ___27. There are many considerations supporting ages 8 - 9 as the optimum starting point in modern language study.
- ___28. The language laboratory if used properly with the necessary materials is a useful teaching aid.
- ___29. Students should have a foundation in the structure of the mother tongue before starting second language study.
- ___30. Students learn to do what they do, and they do not learn what they do not do.
- ___31. Use of English in the classroom should be reserved strictly for giving directions or making simple explanations.
- ___32. Without the use of electro-mechanical devices in foreign language study we must be satisfied with methods and results of the 19th century.

APPENDIX B (continued)

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree

- ___33. A student's past performance in English should not be used as a predictor of his success in a second language.
- ___34. The language laboratory has as many abuses as it has uses.
- ___35. Vocabulary lists are a valuable learning device in any language program.
- ___36. The effectiveness of tape recorders and the like in foreign language study is at best superficial.
- ___37. Learning to use the language is a task in itself without taking on a study of the social, cultural, geographical, and political aspects of its people as well.
- ___38. Foreign language words learned out of context are not retained for very long.
- ___39. From birth every normal child has the facilities for success in foreign language study under the proper conditions.
- ___40. A student learns grammar by familiarizing himself with structure patterns from which he can generalize.
- ___41. Bilingualism should be the goal of all second language learning.
- ___42. The second language should be developed so that it has equal status with the mother tongue but is entirely separate from it.
- ___43. Language always has occurred and always will occur chiefly in its audio-lingual form.
- ___44. Foreign language in the elementary schools (FLES) is of little importance in later study because everything that was learned earlier is repeated.

APPENDIX B (continued)

- 1 Strongly Agree
- 2 Agree
- 3 Neither agree nor disagree
- 4 Disagree
- 5 Strongly Disagree

- ___45. If the use of English will create a more comfortable relationship between pupil and teacher its use should be encouraged.
- ___46. A modern foreign language student should hear only authentic speech, speak only on the basis of what he has heard, read only what has been spoken and write only what he has read.
- ___47. Teacher training in the use and limits of the language laboratory is necessary for optimal effectiveness.
- ___48. The learner should not be permitted to speak English in the modern language class.
- ___49. Most mechanical and electronic devices used for language study are a waste of time and money.
- ___50. It is not necessary to have a good achievement record in English in order to be successful in foreign language studies.

Thank you for your cooperation in this study. A very small percentage of those who have completed this scale will be asked to help in the final phase of the study. For this reason please write your name and school address below.

NAME _____

SCHOOL _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____

COUNTY _____

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

Dear Colleague:

I am making a survey of Florida's modern language teacher's attitudes towards methods of instruction. PLEASE help me by completing the enclosed questionnaire. If more than one form is enclosed please ask your department members to help us by filling them out.

It is hoped that the findings of this survey will give guidance to those who direct both pre-service and in-service education programs. This will be beneficial to all by giving us a solid foundation on which to build our teacher training programs.

PLEASE RETURN ALL QUESTIONNAIRES IN THE STAMPED RETURN ENVELOPES PROVIDED WHETHER COMPLETED OR NOT.

This survey will only be successful with your help.

Thank you very much,

William W. Pinder
3842 S. W. Third Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601

P.S. If you filled out one of these forms at the FFLA Conference in Orlando in October please ask another foreign language teacher to complete it.

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN

October, 1970

Dear Colleague:

I am in the process of completing my study of Florida foreign language teacher attitudes toward teaching methods. The information that the enclosed questionnaires will give me is all the data that I lack. These teachers have been randomly selected and represent the foreign language teachers of Florida in this study.

Please complete the form on each teacher named and return them to me as soon as possible. You may or may not be included in this sample. If you are, please ask one of your colleagues to fill out your form in order to reduce bias.

I hope to let you know the results of this study in a later issue of the Foreign Language Newsletter.

THANK YOU

Sincerely,

William W. Pinder
3842 S. W. 3rd Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601

APPENDIX E

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO FOREIGN LANGUAGE
DEPARTMENT CHAIRMEN ABOUT QUESTIONNAIRE AND SCALE

November, 1970

Dear Colleague:

Recently I sent you the Foreign Language Teacher Questionnaire and Scale of Beliefs. In checking my returns I find that I have not yet heard from anyone from your school.

Realizing that we are approaching a very busy time of year in our schools please let me urge you to complete the questionnaire and scale and send it to me before the Thanksgiving holiday.

You are a part of a random sample representing all modern foreign language teachers in the state of Florida and I would like to hear from as many of you as possible. Please take a few minutes of your busy day and complete the form and return it to me in the stamped, addressed envelope that was provided.

Thank you very much for taking part in this study.

Sincerely,

William W. Pinder

P.S. Please encourage other teachers in your department to complete and return these forms also.

APPENDIX F

LETTER SENT TO A RANDOM GROUP OF FOREIGN
LANGUAGE TEACHERS FOR A SECOND MARKING OF FLSB
FOR A RELIABILITY TEST

Dear Colleague:

This will be the last time that I will impose on you regarding this matter.

I thank you for your help in the past and hope that you will mark the scale section of the enclosed form. This is an essential part of this study. Your marking this form a second time will help me determine the reliability of this instrument.

PLEASE MARK THE SCALE SECTION ON BOTH SIDES AND RETURN TO ME.

THANKS

William W. Pinder
3842 S. W. 3rd Avenue
Gainesville, Florida 32601

APPENDIX G
INTERCORRELATION OF FACTOR SCORES

FACTORS	Factor Score 1 Language Laboratory	Factor Score 2 Age of Learner	Factor Score 3 Back- ground	Factor Score 4 Use of English	Factor Score 5 Methods/ Techniques
Factor Score 1 Language Laboratory	1.0000	0.2017	0.2834	-0.0674	0.2424
Factor Score 2 Age of Learner	0.2017	1.0000	0.5937	-0.0303	0.3970
Factor Score 3 Background	0.2834	0.5937	1.0000	-0.0833	0.2858
Factor Score 4 Use of English	-0.0674	-0.0303	-0.0833	1.0000	-0.0124
Factor Score 5 Methods/ Techniques	0.2424	0.3970	0.2858	-0.0124	1.0000

APPENDIX H

FACTOR LOADINGS FOR FIVE FACTORS SELECTED
FROM A VARIMAX SOLUTION WITH 32 ITEMS AND 12 FACTORS

FLSB Item No.		Factor 1 Language Lab	Factor 2 Age of Learner	Factor 3 Back- ground		Factor 4 Use of English
2	0.0054	-0.0107	0.7430	-0.0502	0.0882	-0.0540
3	-0.1335	-0.2965	0.1088	0.1220	-0.1696	0.0173
6	-0.0459	0.0518	-0.0956	0.2217	-0.0749	0.0331
9	-0.1283	0.2017	-0.1652	-0.1240	0.4536	-0.1664
10	0.1522	-0.1602	0.0211	0.0150	0.1431	0.4524
11	0.0315	-0.0682	-0.0002	0.0566	-0.0349	0.0431
12	-0.1324	0.6529	-0.0616	-0.2035	0.1808	-0.1119
16	0.1059	0.0964	0.0198	0.0971	0.0785	-0.0788
17	0.1590	-0.0470	-0.0825	0.1759	0.0662	0.1177
20	0.0515	-0.3787	-0.0491	0.0179	0.1576	-0.0797
21	-0.2206	0.0536	-0.1120	-0.7358	-0.0284	-0.1620
22	0.0653	-0.0693	0.3546	-0.0352	0.6642	-0.0256
23	-0.0819	-0.7135	0.0102	-0.0275	0.0773	0.0462
25	-0.0939	-0.0223	-0.5685	-0.3259	-0.0673	0.1133
26	-0.2314	-0.3220	-0.1331	-0.1208	-0.0316	-0.3397
27	-0.0047	-0.0243	0.2694	0.0874	0.3079	-0.2809
29	-0.2654	-0.0357	-0.0808	-0.3702	0.2553	0.0481
30	0.0292	-0.0980	0.2115	-0.0212	0.1974	0.1681
31	0.0209	-0.0055	-0.1963	-0.0129	0.0737	0.5148
33	-0.0586	-0.0941	-0.0126	0.7125	-0.0586	0.0542
34	0.4049	0.4148	0.1001	0.1096	0.3865	0.1617
35	-0.3984	0.1441	-0.0860	-0.1304	0.1834	-0.2926
36	-0.0482	0.2227	-0.1248	-0.1754	0.0846	-0.0836
38	0.6627	-0.0159	-0.0086	0.0606	0.0303	-0.0448
39	0.1717	-0.1446	0.0444	0.0535	0.0329	0.0077
40	0.0622	-0.1669	0.0576	0.0133	-0.2009	0.2074
41	-0.1001	0.0804	0.0427	-0.1206	-0.0305	0.0730
43	0.1478	-0.0710	-0.0867	0.2570	0.0825	0.4450
45	0.0495	0.0449	0.0396	-0.1183	0.1298	-0.5660
46	0.3500	-0.0819	0.1474	-0.0126	0.0231	-0.0366
49	-0.1210	0.6244	0.0164	-0.2567	-0.0332	-0.0909
50	-0.0192	-0.1864	-0.0356	0.5857	-0.0279	0.1063

APPENDIX H (extended)

Factor 5					
Methods/ Technique					
-0.0694	0.0032	0.0469	0.0200	-0.0585	-0.0145
0.0329	0.4351	-0.0900	0.1314	0.5128	0.0861
0.2549	0.5282	-0.2508	0.0571	0.0607	0.0600
-0.1467	-0.1705	-0.0996	0.1316	-0.2181	0.0903
0.0051	0.0851	0.0320	-0.1637	0.4904	0.0527
0.0655	0.0883	0.1906	0.1747	0.6691	-0.0625
0.0540	0.0278	0.0480	0.1594	-0.1175	0.1440
0.0823	0.0055	0.5943	0.0408	0.0809	-0.0182
0.0371	0.5383	0.2720	-0.2571	0.1589	0.0210
0.0920	0.1618	0.2823	-0.1205	0.0321	-0.4734
0.2087	-0.0015	-0.0025	-0.0324	-0.1244	0.1077
0.0934	0.0709	0.1257	-0.1197	0.0884	-0.0393
0.1989	0.1460	0.0895	-0.0643	0.0293	-0.0849
-0.2286	0.0076	0.0465	-0.0199	-0.2650	0.1566
-0.2428	0.0036	0.0284	0.3451	-0.2157	0.1840
0.1931	0.1065	0.1552	0.0814	0.2742	-0.0355
-0.2840	0.0689	-0.0274	0.3427	-0.1436	0.0711
0.2765	0.4241	0.3660	-0.0488	0.0520	-0.2535
0.0757	0.3660	0.0071	0.0167	0.0631	-0.2257
0.1999	0.2318	0.0991	-0.1113	0.0259	-0.0482
0.0306	0.0738	0.0733	0.0014	-0.2267	0.0462
-0.2488	-0.1985	-0.0618	0.0752	-0.0097	-0.1239
-0.0372	0.0705	0.0179	-0.0600	-0.0006	0.6644
0.1797	0.1289	0.1272	-0.1590	0.0582	-0.1209
0.7200	0.0589	0.1329	-0.0593	0.0347	-0.0761
0.2999	0.1479	0.4153	0.0201	0.2253	-0.0174
-0.0083	0.0353	0.0480	0.6247	0.1827	-0.0460
0.4892	0.1548	0.1571	-0.0110	0.1281	-0.0082
-0.0076	0.0524	0.0441	-0.0908	-0.0066	-0.0109
-0.0913	0.6190	0.1382	0.1514	0.0786	-0.0003
-0.1357	0.0331	0.2253	-0.2109	-0.1717	0.2851
0.2965	0.0920	0.1042	-0.3612	-0.0780	-0.0880

APPENDIX I

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (FLTQ)

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Response #1</u>	<u>Response #2</u>	<u>Response #3</u>	<u>Response #4</u>	<u>Response #5</u>	<u>No Response</u>
1.	30	93	00	00	00	
2.	23	32	24	26	18	
3.	116	07	00	00	00	
4.	26	33	23	31	10	
5.	00	72	43	03	05	
6.	27	96	00	00	00	
7.	54	21	03	11	08	26*
8.	19	43	24	18	19	
9.	32	91	00	00	00	
10.	13	110	00	00	00	
11.	07	116	--	--	--	
12.	69	54	--	--	--	
13.	76	47	--	--	--	

*No response by 26 respondents to this item because of the nature of the response to item #6. (See Appendix A)

APPENDIX J

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES ON FOREIGN LANGUAGE
SCALE OF BELIEFS (FLSB)

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1.	57	56	08	02	00
2.	27	49	21	23	03
3.	32	56	17	16	02
4.	63	39	12	08	01
5.	05	37	20	44	17
6.	14	34	20	52	03
7.	43	67	07	04	02
8.	78	40	03	02	00
9.	11	14	31	45	22
10.	51	52	10	10	00
11.	53	50	11	08	01
12.	02	05	17	64	35
13.	07	21	23	47	25
14.	32	62	15	12	02
15.	03	05	28	55	32
16.	70	41	04	06	02
17.	41	54	14	13	01
18.	15	36	37	23	12
19.	09	31	19	53	11
20.	28	65	26	04	00
21.	03	11	31	65	13
22.	31	49	20	19	04
23.	09	24	45	32	13
24.	00	00	01	29	93
25.	03	05	10	46	59
26.	09	37	20	28	29
27.	15	49	45	13	01
28.	59	60	03	00	01
29.	17	32	21	46	07
30.	33	48	32	10	00
31.	24	64	19	15	01
32.	04	10	20	54	35
33.	19	33	29	40	02
34.	19	66	18	18	02

APPENDIX J (continued)

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
35.	06	41	35	34	07
36.	01	06	18	75	23
37.	03	14	09	63	34
38.	27	54	21	20	01
39.	29	60	18	14	02
40.	18	71	20	12	02
41.	18	46	23	31	05
42.	10	26	44	42	01
43.	25	61	24	10	03
44.	02	10	13	61	37
45.	02	40	31	43	07
46.	17	25	25	46	10
47.	39	62	18	04	00
48.	05	16	36	56	10
49.	03	05	15	65	35
50.	17	51	25	25	05

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ackerman, T. J. "Language Laboratory Instruction and the Achievement of First Year Students of Spanish in Florida." Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1965.
2. Ackerman, T. J. "The Language Laboratory and Foreign Language Achievement." Special Project 66-70-08 The Florida State University and the State Department of Education of Florida. August, 1966.
3. Banathy, Bela H. "The Design of Foreign Language Teacher Education." Modern Language Journal, 52:490-500, December, 1968.
4. Birkmaier, Emma M. and Lange, Dale L. "What About The Pennsylvania Studies?" Today's Education, 58: 49-51, October, 1969.
5. Bourque, Jane M. "On Theories." Accent on ACTFL, 1:4, June, 1971.
6. Brooks, Nelson. Language and Language Learning-Theory and Practice. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Incorporated, 1964.
7. Carroll, John B. "What Does The Pennsylvania Foreign Language Research Project Tell Us?" Foreign Language Annals, 3:214-236, December, 1969.
8. Clark, John L. D. "The Pennsylvania Project and the 'Audio-Lingual vs. Traditional' Question." Modern Language Journal, 53:388-396, October, 1969.
9. Department of Education. Florida Educational Directory: 1970-71. Tallahassee, Florida: Department of Education, October, 1970.

10. Dodd, Robert E. "Why Have a Language Laboratory?" High Points, 48:71-74, April, 1966.
11. Glass, Gene V. and Stanley, Julian C. Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, 1967.
12. Guertin, Wilson H. and Bailey, John P., Jr. Introduction to Modern Factor Analysis. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Edwards Brothers, Incorporated, 1970.
13. Hayes, Alfred. "What Is the Language Laboratory?" Saturday Review, 46:70-71, February 16, 1963.
14. Hocking, Elton. "A Case Study: The Language Laboratory in a Large Suburban School District." Modern Language Journal, 52:84-86, February, 1968.
15. Hocking, Elton. "The Laboratory in Perspective: Teachers, Strategies, Outcomes." Modern Language Journal, 53:404-410, October, 1969.
16. Hutchinson, Celia Gail. "Effects of Specific Professional Development Activities on Individualization of Instruction in Foreign Language Classes." Doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Florida, 1970.
17. Jarvis, Gilbert A. "A Behavioral Observation System for Classroom Foreign Language Skill Acquisition Activities." Modern Language Journal, 52:335-341, October, 1968.
18. Keating, Raymond F. "A Study of the Effectiveness of Language Laboratories." The Encyclopedia of Educational Research. New York: Macmillan Company, 1969.
19. Leidy, T. R. "Achievement in Modern Languages as a Function of Variations in Language Laboratory Facilities." Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, 24:1711, 1963.

20. Lorge, Sarah W. "Language Laboratory Research Studies in New York City High Schools." ERIC Microfiche ED 012 158, November, 1964, and Modern Language Journal, 48:409-414, November, 1964.
21. Mackey, William F. "Practice-Teaching: Models and Modules." Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education. Volume I. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Incorporated, 1968.
22. Maynes, J. Oscar, Jr. "An Experiment to Gauge the Effectiveness of the Audio-Lingual Method and the Language Lab." Glendale High School, Glendale, Arizona. Report, n.p., n.d. Research on Language Teaching. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1965.
23. McArdle, Richard J. "Teacher Education, Qualifications and Supervision." Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education. Volume I. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Incorporated, 1968.
24. McKim, Lester W., Ed. "Designing and Using Language Laboratories." Audiovisual Instruction, 13: 454-456, May, 1968.
25. McKim, Lester W., Ed. "Recent Trends in Foreign Language Teaching Techniques and Materials." Audiovisual Instruction, 13:450-453, May, 1968.
26. Moskowitz, Gertrude. "The Effects of Training Foreign Language Teachers in Interaction Analysis." Foreign Language Annals, 1:218-235, March, 1968.
27. Otto, Frank. "The Teacher in the Pennsylvania Project." Modern Language Journal, 53:411-420, October, 1969.
28. Paquette, F. André. "Undergraduate Modern Foreign Language Teacher-Training in Liberal Arts Colleges: A Survey." Modern Language Journal, 48:424-431, November, 1964.
29. Politzer, Robert L. and Bartley, Diana. "Practice Centered Teacher Training, Spanish: A Syllabus for the Training or Retraining of Teachers of Spanish." Stanford Center for Research and

Development in Teaching, Stanford, California, 1967. Britannica Review of Foreign Language Education. Volume I. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Incorporated, 1968.

30. Poulin, Norman A. "Foreign Language Study: A New Rationale." Clearing House, 44:286-289, January, 1970.
31. Rivers, Wilga M. "Teaching Foreign Language Skills: Objectives and Methods." The Case for Foreign-Language Study: A Collection of Readings. Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Incorporated, 1971.
32. Scherer, George A. C. and Wertheimer, Michael. A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill, Incorporated, 1964.
33. Smith, Phillip D. and Baranyi, Helmut A. "A Comparison Study of the Effectiveness of the Traditional and Audio-lingual Approaches to Foreign Language Instructions Utilizing Laboratory Equipment." United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, ERIC Microfiche ED 030 013, October, 1968.
34. Stack, Edward M. The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 1966.
35. Valette, Rebecca M. "The Pennsylvania Project, Its Conclusions and Its Implications." Modern Language Journal, 53:396-404, October, 1969.